

IDENTIFICATION OF POSSIBLE QUESTIONS FOR FURTHER CONSIDERATION AND DISCUSSION REGARDING DATA COLLECTION AND USE IN THE ACCREDITATION SYSTEM

The workgroup has begun discussing data collection and use in CTC's accreditation system. Based partly on the discussion at the October meeting, staff offers the following structure and questions as a starting point for the November discussion on data. *If the standards adopted by the Commission define quality and effectiveness for 1)the unit and 2)the preparation programs, what data will provide evidence that the standards are being met?*

Work group members will discuss whether the questions below are the right questions, whether other questions should be considered in place of or in addition. Following a discussion of the questions, workgroup members can decide how to go about addressing these questions. It is not anticipated that the group will attempt to answer these questions at the November meeting, only identify which questions are pertinent to this review.

Categories of Data that could be Collected:

Measuring quality *and* effectiveness of 1) the education unit and 2) the preparation programs

1. Does the Commission's accreditation system do an effective job of using data to measure both quality and effectiveness of 1) the unit and 2) the preparation programs?
2. If not, what is lacking? What types of data and evidence would help us address this?
3. Does the accreditation system do an effective job of considering outcomes? What types of data or evidence would be necessary to improve in this manner? (BTSA data, employer survey data)

Measuring Candidate Competence

1. Does our current system of accreditation adequately consider candidate competence in the accreditation of educator preparation programs?
2. If it does not, what needs to be changed? Do our processes and procedures need changing? Which ones? Do our standards need changing? Is Standard 19 sufficient or should the group recommend the Commission consider adopting a standard like NCATE Standard 1?
3. What instruments or methods could be used to measure an institution's effectiveness in developing candidate competence?
 - i. Would the TPA, if fully and consistently implemented across the state, prove useful in trying to assess an institution's effectiveness in preparing competent teachers?
 - ii. Would BTSA retention data be useful?
 - iii. Would employer surveys be useful?
 - iv. Which measurements should be required versus allowable?
4. How could valid measures of candidate competence change the accrediting system? Could rewards (a pass on a site visit, extended site visit cycle) and sanctions (closer follow up, site visits on a narrower time scale) be adjusted depending on candidate competence?

Uses of the Data that is Collected:

An institution's use of data to make informed programmatic and unit level decisions.

1. To what extent should our accreditation system ensure that data is used in an on-going manner by an institution to drive decision-making and programmatic improvements?
2. Is the Commission's Evaluation Standard – Standard 4 sufficient to elicit the types of information needed by an accreditation team and COA to determine whether an institution is making programmatic improvements based on data?
3. If not, does the Commission need to consider altering Standard 4 to something similar to NCATE standard 2? Or something entirely different?
4. If it is not a matter of changes in standards, what other kinds of changes could ensure that the institution is using data on an on-going manner to make informed programmatic and unit level decisions?

The Commission's collection and use of data to inform accreditation decisions.

1. Is there data the Commission should review on an annual or periodic basis (between site visits)?
2. If so, what kinds of data should be reviewed? Who should review it? How often? And to what end or purpose? (to indicate possible issues that need further investigation or response, to "trigger" a focused site visit, to indicate that there appears to be no problems and site visits might be extended, etc.)
3. What is the appropriate role of pass rate and Title II information in accreditation reviews?
4. Should data (e.g. pass rate and Title II information) be used to identify potential problems that might be further investigated? Should the Commission adopt a policy and procedures that clarifies that data that indicates that an institution's pass rates are clearly an "outlier" can require further investigation and response?

Efficiency and Focus of Data Collected:

The manner in which data is reviewed and utilized by the accreditation system

1. How might the Commission's accreditation system be restructured to reduce the burden and cost on an institution and on an accreditation team?
2. Does the Commission need to identify what is required and what is optional – given its breadth and flexibility attribute?
3. Can the review of data and evidence be done differently? In advance of a site visit? To structure a site visit?
4. Might the collection of some types of data excuse certain aspects of the site visit?
5. Should the Commission allow only electronic evidence rooms that can be reviewed prior to a review?